

The Classical Weekly

Published weekly, on Mondays, except in weeks in which there is a legal or a School holiday, from October 1, to May 31, at
Barnard College, New York City. Subscription price, \$2.00 per volume.
Entered as second-class matter November 18, 1907, at the Post Office, New York, N.Y., under the Act of Congress of
March 3, 1879.
Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized on
June 28, 1918.

VOL. XVI, No. 2

MONDAY, OCTOBER 9, 1922

WHOLE No. 425

Latin Prose Composition -

SCOTT'S SECOND YEAR LATIN COMPOSITION

115 Pages

\$0.80

SCOTT'S THIRD YEAR LATIN COMPOSITION

160 Pages

.80

JONES-DRAKE'S LATIN PROSE COMPOSITION

166 Pages

1.20

Scott's Series for the Second and Third Years is planned to cover the essential principles and to drill thoroughly on these by means of simple sentences.

In addition to thirty-five (35) Lessons, there is an Appendix of Latin Grammar and an English-Latin Vocabulary.

Useful "aids" which we are glad to send free to teachers:

'Some Points of Emphasis in Teaching First Year Latin'

—H. F. Scott

'English Words from Latin' —Miss Marie Denneen

'Guardians of the Lamp'—a plea for Latin in the High School

A Drill Card on Irregular Verbs

SCOTT, FORESMAN AND COMPANY

Publishers of the LAKE Latin Series

CHICAGO
623 South Wabash Ave.

NEW YORK
5 West 19th St.

In the Allen and Greenough Series

SELECT ORATIONS AND LETTERS OF CICERO SIX ORATIONS OF CICERO

These Books meet the College Entrance Requirements for 1923-1925 in content.

They meet the requirements of alert teachers in all matters of editing, illustrations, typography, and binding.

Ginn and Company

	Boston	New York	Chicago	London
Atlanta		Dallas	Columbus	San Francisco

READINGS FROM

OVID'S METAMORPHOSES

Cadmus	Midas	Niobe	Pyramus and Thisbe
Daedalus and Icarus	Perseus and Andromeda		
Orpheus and Eurydice			

are required by the College Board
for 1923-24-25

Gleason's *A Term of Ovid—Revised*
meets these requirements to the letter

AMERICAN BOOK COMPANY

Cincinnati	Chicago	Boston	Atlanta
------------	---------	--------	---------

The Classical Weekly

VOL. XVI, No. 2

MONDAY, OCTOBER 9, 1922

WHOLE NO. 425

SOME RANDOM NOTES ON HORACE

I

One of my pupils, when asked to enumerate some of the subjects of Horace's Odes, remarked, "Wine, Woman, and Song". In point of fact, of the 104 poems comprised by Carmina 1-4, and the Carmen Saeculare, six are in praise of wine or in honor of Bacchus, twenty-seven may be classed as love-poems, and eight deal with the poet's art and power¹.

This rough classification ignores entirely, however, one of the most important of the poet's sources of inspiration—patriotism. Under this head may be classed nineteen poems, some of which are among the finest in the entire collection²—even though Horace insists³ that love, not war, is his theme. To be sure, many of these dwell rather on the blessings of peace.

Other favorite subjects are Love of Home (5 poems)⁴; 'Live Now' (3)⁵; Contentment is Better than Wealth (4)⁶; Peace and Contentment (3)⁷; The Shortness of Human Life (3)⁸; Simplicity and Moderation (4)⁹. There are also poems on spring (3)¹⁰, poems on religion in general (2)¹¹, and those written specifically to honor a particular deity (5)¹², the playful or semi-humorous treatment of incidents in his own experience or that of his friends (5)¹³, 'Bon Voyage' or 'Welcome Home' (3)¹⁴, praise of a friend's literary attainments (1)¹⁵, and A Crumb from Homer's Table (1)¹⁶. To be sure, it is often difficult to tie the poet down to a single theme, and it must be remembered that the preceding classification is tentative only.

II

A different basis for the consideration of the Odes is afforded by the names of the persons in whose honor they are written. Eight are dedicated to Maecenas¹⁷, four to Augustus¹⁸, twenty-three to various friends mentioned in each instance by name¹⁹, six to the Muses (three of them to Melpomene)²⁰, thirteen to the gods (Venus 3, Bacchus 2, Apollo 1, Apollo and Diana 2, Diana 1, Mercury 2, Faunus and the Goddess of Antium each 1)²¹, twenty-one to persons either imaginary or mentioned under fictitious names (six

male, fifteen female)²², and one to an unnamed and probably imaginary hearer²³, a palinode to one who is probably a real person and is therefore unnamed²⁴, a poem to one in love (perhaps Horace himself)²⁵, one addressed to his slave²⁶, two to his boon companions²⁷, one to the spirit of the philosopher Archytas²⁸, four to the rising generation²⁹, one to the Romans in general³⁰, one to the plebs urbana in particular³¹, one to choruses of boys and girls³², and seven³³ that are addressed to no one in particular³⁴. Besides, there are two monologues (Neobule, Europa)³⁵, a dialogue³⁶, and five poems addressed to inanimate objects: To the Ship of State (1.14), To his Lyre (1.32), To an Accursed Tree (2.13), To the Bandusian Fountain (or To the Nymph of the Fountain, 3.13), To his Jug (3.21).

III

It has occurred to me that an interesting basis for a more general classification of the Odes would be the question of origin: Is the poem under consideration spontaneous or is it made to order? A still more illuminating grouping is that suggested by the nature of the subject-matter: is it serious or playful, earnest or humorous? For it is often possible to get an entirely new impression of a poet and his work by reading a related series of poems.

The majority of the Odes are, of course, spontaneous. Indeed, only three³⁷ can be definitely set down as written at the express command of another. With regard to these we have the statement of Suetonius, Vita Horati: Scripta quidem eius usque adeo <Augustus> probavit. . . ut non modo Saeculare Carmen componendum iniunxerit, sed et Vindelicam victoriam Tiberii Drusique, privignorum suorum. . . Two of the three strike the reader as formal, labored, ineffectual. In brilliant contrast stand the six great patriotic Odes, 3.1-6; although the idea of writing such a series may have come from the Emperor, we have here a work of real genius. The keynote struck in the introductory stanza is maintained throughout, and we feel that Horace is the inspired mouthpiece of his country's guardian spirits.

Two other poems, however, show evidences of artificiality which might lead to their inclusion in the

¹For the poems on love see 1.5, 8, 13, 16, 17, 19, 23, 25, 30, 33; 2.4, 5, 8; 3.7, 9, 10, 11, 12, 15, 20, 26, 27, 28; 4.1, 10, 11, 13. For poems on wine see 1.18, 20, 27; 2.10; 3.10, 21. For poems on song see 1.1, 26, 32; 2.20; 4.3, 8, 9.

²See 1.2, 12, 14, 35, 37; 2.15; 3.1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 14, 25; 4.2, 4, 5, 14, 15. Perhaps the Carmen Saeculare should be added. 2.15 is patriotic in purpose, but is scarcely comparable with the rest in form. See IV below.

³1.6; 2.12, ⁴1.7; 2.6; 3.13, 18, 22. ⁵1.9, 11; 2.11. ⁶2.2, 18; 3.16, 24. ⁷2.16; 3.17, 29. ⁸1.28; 2.3, 14. ⁹1.24, 38; 2.9, 10, 11.4; 4.7, 12. ¹⁰1.34; 3.23. ¹¹1.10, 21, 31; 4.6; Carmen Saeculare. ¹²1.22, 29; 2.13, 17; 3.8. ¹³1.3, 36; 2.7. ¹⁴2.1. ¹⁵1.15. ¹⁶1.1, 20; 2.12, 17, 20; 3.8, 16, 29 (see also 4.11). ¹⁷1.2; 4.5, 14.15. ¹⁸1.3, 4, 6, 7, 18, 22, 29, 33; 2.1, 2, 3, 6, 7, 9, 10, 11, 16; 3.17; 4.2, 7, 8, 9, 12 (see also 3.10, 26). ¹⁹1.12, 24, 26; 3.4, 30; 4.3 (see also 3.3, 70). ²⁰1.10, 30, 31, 35; 2.10; 3.11, 18, 22, 25, 26; 4.1, 6; Carmen Saeculare.

²¹1.5, 8, 9, 11, 13, 17, 23, 25; 2.4, 8, 14; 3.7, 10, 15, 19, 20, 23, 28; 4.10, 11, 13. ²²1.16. ²³2.5. ²⁴1.38 (see also 3.14, 17). ²⁵1.27, 37. ²⁶1.28. ²⁷3.1, 2, 3, 5. ²⁸3.6. ²⁹3.14. ³⁰1.21.

³¹1.15, 19, 34, 36; 2.15; 3.24; 4.4.

³²Professor Charles E. Bennett, in his edition of the Odes and Epodes, page 70, made an odd misstatement when he wrote, of 2.15, "This poem stands alone among Horace's odes in that it is not addressed to any individual". This misstatement rests, apparently, upon a misunderstanding of Kiessling's remark, in his Oden und Epoden³, page 220, concerning this poem: "Das Gedicht, welches jeder persönlichen Beziehung entbehrt, steht unter den Oden in diesem Punkte einzig da".

³³3.12, 27.

³⁴3.9.

³⁵4.4, 14; Carmen Saeculare.

'made to order' category: the stilted protest against luxury (2.15), which fails to ring as true as does 2.18 or 3.1 on the same theme—though, to be sure, Kiessling suggests that these lines may be a remnant discarded from 3.1-6, as unsatisfactory there, and yet published here as a separate poem—, and the rather cold and formal hymn in praise of Apollo and Diana (1.21), which, as the same editor remarks, may have some connection with the Secular Games planned by Augustus for an earlier year, but postponed.

Five other Odes may be classed as semispontaneous: 4.6, which is a sort of prelude to the *Carmen Saeculare*; 4.1, which serves to introduce the new collection of poems whose publication was due to the wish of the Emperor (Book 4); 1.6, wherein the poet protests his inability to sing Agrippa's praises—and does so, most acceptably; 2.12, to Maecenas, on a similar theme, claiming that Caesar's martial deeds are no fit theme for the poet of love; 2.17, an almost resentful repudiation of the fears of Maecenas, *Cur me querellis exanimas tuis?* All five, however, are on a far higher poetic plane than the uninspired efforts mentioned above, and exhibit spontaneity of utterance, whatever the reason for their composition.

IV

If we try to classify the Odes of Horace as serious or in lighter vein, we find that most of them fall under the former head, as follows: A. Serious Poems—(1) Patriotic, (2) Philosophical, (3) Poems of Friendship, (4) The Love of Home, (5) On Poesy, (6) Miscellaneous; B. Humorous Poems. The details are as follows.

A. SERIOUS POEMS

(1) Patriotic: A God in Human Guise, 1.2, Rome's Muster-Roll of Heroes, 1.12, The Ship of State, 1.14, The Man of Destiny, 1.35, Our Enemies Have Fallen, 1.37, Contentment and Frugality, 3.1, Hardihood, Valor, and Fidelity, 3.2, Righteous Perseverance, 3.3, On the Power of the Muses, and on Intelligent Might, 3.4, Courage and Loyalty, 3.5, Reverence and Righteousness, 3.6, Welcome Home, Augustus, 3.14, An Inspired Dithyramb in Praise of Augustus, 3.25, An Unstudied Tribute, from the 'Matine Bee', to the Emperor, 4.2, All Honor to Rome's Heroes, 4.4, Rome's Longing for Her Absent Leader, 4.5, In Praise of Tiberius—and Augustus, 4.14, Not War, But the Blessings of Peace, 4.15, *Carmen Saeculare*.

(2) Philosophical: (a) Religious, The Poet's Conversion from Error, 1.34, Pure Religion and Undeveloped, 3.23; (b) On the Shortness of Life, Spring, and the Passing Seasons, 1.4, Death the Common Lot, 1.28, On Equanimity, and the Shortness of Life, 2.3, The Fleeting Years, 2.14, Spring and the Shortness of Life, 4.7; (c) 'While it is To-day', Enjoy the Present Hour, 1.9, Live Now, 1.11, Why Worry? Live Now, 2.11; (d) The Vanity of Riches, Simplicity, 1.38, The Wise Man Alone is Rich, 2.2, A Protest Against Luxury, 2.15, The Power of Gold, and its Weakness, 3.16, An Arraignment of Riches, 3.24; (e) The Golden Mean, Threnody, 1.24, Moderation, Even in Mourning, 2.9, The Golden Mean, 2.10; (f) The Footpath to Peace, The Poet's Prayer, 1.31, Peace and Contentment, 2.16, Contentment is Better than Wealth, 2.18, The Secret of Happiness, 3.29.

(3) Poems of Friendship: Propemptikon, 1.3, Welcome Home!, 1.36, 2.7, Why Worry?, 2.17, Forget the Cares of State, 3.8.

(4) The Love of Home, Be it Ever so Humble!, 1.7, Love of Home, and Thoughts of Death, 2.6, The

Cool, Clear Spring, 3.13, A Country Festival, 3.18, Dedication of a Pine to Diana, 3.22.

(5) On Poesy: Dedication of the Odes to Maecenas, 1.1, Love, Not War, the Poet's Theme, 1.6, 2.12, In Praise of the Muses, and of Lamia, 1.26, A Prelude—Praise of Song, 1.32, Dedication to Pollio, and Praise of his Literary Work, 2.1, Epilogue—The Poet's Immortality, 3.30, The True Poet is Born, Not Made, 4.3, Prelude to the *Carmen Saeculare*, 4.6, In Praise of Poetry, 4.8, The Poet's Immortality brings to Others Undying Fame, 4.9.

(6) Miscellaneous: In Praise of Mercury, 1.10, A Crumb from Homer's Table, 1.15, In Praise of Bacchus and of Wine, 1.18, 2.19, In Praise of Diana and Apollo, 1.21.

B. HUMOROUS OR PLAYFUL POEMS

(This category includes some of the most delightful Odes): An Invitation—With a Warning Annexed, 1.20, Wolf-proof—And an Incurable Lover, 1.22, Drinking Scene, 1.27, A Sow's Ear out of a Silk Purse, 1.29, That Accursed Tree!, 2.13, The Poet as Bird, 2.20, Storm Without, Peace Within—With a Cannibal Laestrygonian, 3.17, A Revel, 3.19, Ode to a Jug, 3.21, 'Give a Rouse then in the Maytime', 4.12.

V

The love-poems are of sufficient importance to deserve separate treatment. Horace professes to be preeminently the poet of love. He rebukes his Muse for dwelling on serious themes (2.1.39-40); on one occasion (2.12) refuses even to celebrate the achievements of the Emperor when his friend Maecenas requests him to do so; and, further, describing the theme of his 'unwarlike lyre', says (1.6.17-20),

nos proelia virginum
sectis in iuvenes unguibus acrim
cantamus, vacui sive quid urimur
non praeter solitum leves.

The large number of love-poems among the Odes would appear to substantiate his claim. Upon reading them, however, we often find ourselves at a loss to determine whether on a given occasion Horace is *vacuus* or *quid uritur*! On the whole, we are inclined to agree with the poet's own analysis (3.9.22-23): *levior cortice et improbo iracundior Hadria* (I explain below that I believe that, in this Ode, Horace is writing of himself). There are, however, certain indications of real feeling—often of resentment and even of malice—which may serve to distinguish poems of passion from the graceful but unconvincing imitations which are far more numerous. Before seeking to distinguish the false from the true, let us try to give titles to his love-poems that may afford some indication of their contents:

Farewell to Love, 1.5 (compare 3.26); Love's Enervating Power, 1.8; Love and Jealousy, 1.13 (compare Catullus 51); Palinode (On Anger), 1.16; Love in the Country, 1.17; Venus Bids me Sing of Love, 1.19 (compare 1.30); Youth is Shy, 1.23; On Waning Love, 1.25 (compare 3.15; 4.13); A Fit Abode for Love, 1.30 (compare 1.19; 1.33; 3.19.28); Slighted Love, 1.33 (compare 1.19, 30); Love for A Slave Girl, 2.4; 'Not Yet!', 2.5 (compare 1.22.23); False but Fair, 2.8; Faith in Absence, 3.7; A Dialogue: Reconciliation, 3.9; The Obdurate Wife, 3.10 (compare 4.13); Take Warning, Lyde!, 3.11 (compare 3.28; 2.11.22); Neobule's Monologue: Secret Love, 3.12; The Old Coquette, 3.15 (compare 1.25; 4.13);

Indifference, 3.20; Farewell to Love, 3.26 (compare 1.5); Europa's Monologue, 3.27; In Praise of Folly, 3.28 (compare 3.11; 2.11.22); The Veteran Recalled to Love's Service, 4.1; 'Gather Ye Roses while Ye May', 4.10; Last Love the Best, 4.11; The Whirligig of Time Brings in His Revenges, 4.13 (compare 1.25; 3.15).

Classifying these poems by the name of the individual in whose honor, or the reverse, they are written, we find that Glycera and Lydia head the list with four Odes apiece to their credit³⁸; Lyde and Pholoe come next, with three each³⁹; Chloe, Chloris, Cinara, Lalage, Ligurinus, and Lyce are tied with two poems each⁴⁰; to the rest but one reference is made⁴¹. I have included in this list the names of several persons to whom there is a passing allusion in poems not ostensibly poems of love⁴².

Though all the names in poems of this class are doubtless pseudonyms when they refer to real persons, and the majority are, perhaps, purely fictitious, descriptive of a type rather than of an individual, it would seem a reasonable assumption that, when we have a name repeated, it refers always to the same person, and it is a tempting supposition that some, at least, of those frequently mentioned represent actual persons known to the poet and his readers. This theory leads us to consider with some interest the personalities presented to us under the guise of Chloe, Chloris, Cinara, Glycera, Lalage, Ligurinus, Lyce, Lydia, and Pholoe.

Lyde is described as an obstinate maid (3.11.7-12); she may well take warning from the myth of the Danaids, which is beautifully related in the following stanzas, stanzas comparable in style and subject-matter to 1.15. In 3.11 Horace is evidently interested primarily in the artistic presentation of his mythological material; Lyde serves merely to point the moral and adorn the tale: she is forgotten by the time the story ends. She may have had a prototype in some susceptible young woman whom the poet thus maliciously pillories in a spirit of pique, but there is no deeper feeling involved; in fact, the heroine may be quite as imaginary as the Danaids themselves. But the former supposition would seem to gain support from the deliberately saucy reference in 2.11.21-24 (on these verses see Kiessling's plausible notes). Finally, the playful request (3.28) that Lyde shall invite him to celebrate with her the Neptunalia in rollicking fashion, not forgetting to pay due honor to the goddess of Cnidos, has more point if we bear in mind the picture conjured up by the preceding references: a somewhat prim (2.11.23-24) and self-sufficient young woman, a blue-stocking, *eburna cum lyra*, who has no time for philandering.

³⁸For Glycera, see 1.19, 30, 33; 3.19. For Lydia see 1.8, 13, 25; 3.9. ³⁹For Lyde, see 2.11; 3.11, 28. For Pholoe, see 1.33; 2.5; 3.15. ⁴⁰For Chloe, see 1.23 and 3.26; for Chloris, 2.5 and 3.15; for Cinara, 4.1, 13; for Lalage, 1.22 and 2.5; for Ligurinus, 4.1, 10; for Lyce, 3.10 and 4.13. ⁴¹Their names are Asterie, 3.7; Barine, 2.8; Chia, 4.13; Dumalis, 1.36; Galatea, 3.27; Licymnia, 2.12; Lycoris, 1.33; Myrtale, 1.33; Neaera, 3.14; Nearchus (and Pyrrhus), 3.20; Neobule, 3.12; Pyrrha, 1.8; Phyllis, 4.11; Rhode, 3.19; Tyndaris, 1.17; Xanthias, 2.4; and the 'fairer daughter' of 1.16.

⁴²1.22, 36; 2.11, 12; 3.14, 19. I have purposely omitted Leucooe, Megilla, and Phidyle, 1.11, 27; 3.23.

Glycera seems to have made more of an impression on the poet's heart. This we infer not so much from the direct statement, *me lentus Glycerae torret amor meae* (3.19.28), as from the two charming poems (1.19, 30) in her honor, and from the later Ode (1.33) to Tibullus, bidding him *ne doleas plus nimio memor immitis Glycerae*. Some have held that the Glycera of 1.33 is to be identified with the Nemesis or the Delia of Tibullus. If we accept this not unreasonable hypothesis, the question naturally arises whether all the other names in the Ode, Lycoris, Cyrus, Pholoe, Myrtale, are also those of real persons. Kiessling notes that the name Lycoris is borrowed from the elegies of Gallus, and the name Pholoe from Tibullus himself (1.8.69); Myrtale is a common name for freedwomen. Perhaps Horace had in mind some actual couples whose course of true love was far from smooth, but we need not make such an assumption merely to justify the preceding identification. But *Pholoe fugax* (2.5) is mentioned in the same stanza with a Chloris whose gleaming shoulders vie with the sheen of moonlight on summer seas; in 3.15 Chloris, now grown old, still seeks to rival the more youthful charms of Pholoe, who, we now learn, is her own daughter! 3.15, however, while similar in theme to 1.25 and 4.13, lacks the undertone of real feeling that characterizes those Odes. We conclude, therefore, that Chloris and Pholoe are pseudonyms of real persons, but that Horace was not moved by either. This much established, it seems reasonable to credit Lycoris, Cyrus, and Myrtale too with reality. Cyrus is mentioned in 1.17.25 also.

Cinara, one of the poet's earliest sweethearts (4.1.4), seems to have won a lasting place in his affections. He speaks of her short life (4.13.22-23), in the second of the poems to Lyce (who succeeded Cinara in his affections), and still thinks of her when he is writing his Epistles (1.7.28; 1.14.33).

Chloe seems to have made a deeper and more lasting impression on the young poet's heart. She is mentioned in one of the earliest Odes (1.23) and again in one of the latest Odes (3.26) of the first three books, and the brilliantly unexpected turn given to the close of the latter poem, professedly a renunciation of Venus and all her works, has a ring of sincerity that amounts to bitterness: *O . . . regina, sublimi flagello tange Chloen semel arrogantem*⁴³.

In Lalage (1.22; 2.5) we have an attractive, smiling, little chatterbox, whose youthful abandon has won the poet's admiring regard—although not to the exclusion of thoughts of other charmers from the poem (2.5.17-24) in which he seeks to console himself for her lack of interest.

The first of the two poems addressed to Lyce (3.10) has a tensivity and an air of repressed passion that carry conviction, much as one would wish to consider this merely a lyric variation of a favorite theme of the Greek erotic poets, and the tone of malicious gloating, of exultant mockery, that characterizes the second

⁴³The Chloe of 3.7.10 is doubtless a purely mythical character, like the Asterie and the Gyges of the same poem.

poem (4.13) substantiates this unpleasing suspicion. The mention of Cinara in this poem is a further indication that Lyce is a real person.

Lydia stands out as one of the most lifelike of all the poet's sweethearts, real or imaginary. This is doubtless due in large measure to the delightful Ode, in dialogue form, *Donec gratus eram tibi*, etc. (3.9), in which is celebrated the reconciliation between a maiden and her lover: can we doubt that the lover was Horace himself? And we may note that the allusions made, in verses 6, 9-10, 19, support what was said above with regard to this fair charmer. Earlier poems containing references to Lydia—1.8, which portrays the enervating power of love, clearly discerned by a rival's sharp eyes, 1.13, which pictures the pangs of jealousy, and 1.25, which describes the desolate lot in store for the proud beauty who now disdains the poet—all have a tinge of bitterness which seems to bear witness to a real passion⁴. Perhaps Horace was really in earnest when he said (3.9.24), *tecum vivere amem, tecum obeam libens*, even while he put the words into Lydia's mouth rather than his own.

Of the poems of love whose heroines are mentioned but once each, there is a group of seven which may be at once set aside as purely works of art with no subjective coloring. The group includes the charming monologue of Neobule (3.12), the consolation of an obviously mythical Asterie (3.7), the reference, in a poem celebrating the return of Pomponius Numida, to a certain Damalis, who is clearly a type (1.36), the personification of indifference under the name of Nearchus (3.20), the passing allusion to Rhode (3.19), the fair Chian (4.13.7) whose youthful beauty is such a contrast to the wrinkled age of Lyce, and the mock-serious encouragement of Xanthias in his love for the slave-girl Phyllis (2.4). The concluding lines of 2.4 give color to the suspicion that this poem may have been inspired by some gossip about a Flavius (= Xanthias) prominent in court circles. Furthermore, the Galatea of 3.27 is obviously a creature of the imagination only, a mere pretext for the retelling of the Europa myth.

The Neaera of 3.14, a poem of welcome to Augustus, might likewise be considered a lay figure were it not for the earlier reference in Epode 15.11-14. The unexpected turn given to this poem at its close, *si per invisum mora ianitorem fiet, abito*, and the rather touching allusion to the poet's gray hairs are the only redeeming touches in an otherwise disappointing Ode; the lack of harmony between the austere and even frigid beginning and the inappropriately rollicking conclusion is very evident, even to the casual reader.

The Licymnia of 2.12, an Ode addressed to Maecenas, has with considerable plausibility been identified with Maecenas's wife, Terentia.

The Tyndaris who is invited by Horace in a charming pastoral poem (1.17) to share the delights of his Sabine farm is doubtless only a creature of his imagination.

⁴This of course requires us to regard Telephus of 1.13 (3.19; 4.17) also as a real person.

The auburn-haired maid of the first love-poem (1.5), Pyrrha, would perhaps be more lifelike if the Ode itself were not so exquisitely polished⁵. We feel that, if Horace ever really loved this wrecker of hearts, it must have been in the distant past (he has quite evidently made good his escape), or else he is conjuring up a charming vampire for the delectation of his readers. This Ode is like a description Odysseus might have given of the Sirens—after he was safe back in Ithaca.

This same fatal perfection of form discourages us from accepting as authentic the faithless maiden of Barium (2.8)⁶. This representation is probably a composite picture, not a photograph.

The unnamed beauty of 1.16, *O matre pulchra filia pulchrior*, is almost certainly to be regarded as an actual maiden held up to ridicule in a previous poem. If so, it is useless to hunt through the published collection for the offending poem; Horace would scarcely be guilty of so grave a breach of good faith following upon his earlier indiscretion. The poet had been *celer irasci* (Epist. 1.20.25); he is now *placabilis*, and wishes his lady-love to resemble him in this latter respect.

The Phyllis of 4.11 (a poem in honor of the birthday of his friend and patron), *meorum finis amorum*, may well have had a prototype in actual life.

Perhaps the most touching of all the personal glimpses afforded by the Odes is that in which Horace speaks of himself as friendless and alone as old age approaches (4.1)—a not unusual penalty for youthful indiscretion and coquetry. And with the years comes the passing of his erstwhile joy in merry drinking-bouts with boon companions of like irresponsibility and careless optimism. And then follow those affecting words of regret of longing for the days that are no more, which carry with them the impress of deep feeling and the unmistakable stamp of truth:

Sed cur, heu Ligurine, cur
manat rara meas lacrima per genas?
cur facunda parum decoro
inter verba cadit lingua silentio?

In the Ligurinus of this Ode (who is again addressed, in the stilted style of the Greek epigrams, in 4.10, an artificial poem), we are fain to catch a glimpse of one of the poet's boyhood friends whose memory, lingering yet in the dreams of age, brings back happy recollections not untinged with regret.

VI

In concluding these Notes, I would call attention to the frequency with which the main thought of a poem is concisely expressed in a stanza or even in a single verse (we may think here of the Roman love of *sententiae*). This is notably true of 3.1-6, whose texts may be briefly stated as follows: *Desiderantem quod satis est* (3.1.25); *Dulce et decorum est pro patria*

⁵Does not the same consideration militate against taking 3.9 seriously? In connection with 1.16, reference may be made to a paper on this Ode, by Dr. E. H. Sturtevant, in *The Classical Review* 26(1912), 119-122. Dr. Sturtevant thinks that Canidia was the *pulchra mater* whom, in his youth, he had assailed, and that the *pulchrior filia* of 1.16 is the Tyndaris of 1.17.

mori (3.2.13); Iustum et tenacem propositi virum (3.3.1); Vis consili expers mole ruit sua (3.4.65); nec vera virtus, cum semel excidit, curat reponi deterioribus (3.5.29-30); Dis te minorem quod geris, imperas (3.6.5).

For the other Odes, the following list is meant to be suggestive only; it is doubtless open to criticism at many points.

Book 1

1, Quod si me lyricis vatibus inseris, sublimi feriam sidera vertice (35-36); 2, Quem vocet divum populus ruentis imperi rebus? (25-26); 3, Nil mortalibus ardui est (37); 4, Vitae summa brevis spem nos vetat incohare longam (15); 5, Miseri, quibus intentata nites! (12-13); 6, 17-20; 7, 10-14; 8, 1-3; 9, 13-16; 10, <Mercurius>, superis deorum gratus et imis (19-20); 11, Carpe diem (8); 12, tu <Iuppiter> secundo Caesare regnes (51-52); 13, 17-20; 14, tu nisi ventis debes ludibrium, cave (15-16); 15, quanta moves funera Dardanae genti (10-11); 16, 25-28; 17, 14-16; 18, siccis omnia nam dura deus proposuit (3); 19, in me tota ruens Venus Cyprum deseruit (9-10); 20, 10-12; 21, 1-2; 23, Integer vitae scelerisque purus (1); 23, 11-12; 24, Durum: sed levius fit patientia quidquid corrigere est nefas (11-12); 25, 6-8; 26, Nil sine te mei prosunt honores (9-10); 27, 1-4; 28, Omnes una nox manet et caldanda semel via leti (15-16); 29, pollicitus meliora (16); 30, 3-4; 31, 16-20; 32, 13-16; 33, 10-12; 34, 1-5; 35, 38-40; 36, 1-3; 37, Nunc est bibendum, nunc pede libero pulsanda tellus (1-2); 38, Simplici myrto nihil adlabores sedulus curo (5-6).

Book 2

1.37-40; 2.9-12; 3, Aequam memento rebus in arduis servare mentem (1-2); 4, 1; 5, Nondum subacta ferre iugum valet cervice (1-2); 6, 5-6; 7, recepto dulce mihi furere est amico (27-28); 8, 5-8; 9, desine mollium tandem querellarum (17-18); 10, Auream quisquis mediocritatem diligit (5-6); 11, quid aeternis minorem consiliis animum fatigas? (11-12); 12, 9-12; 13, 13-14; 14, Eheu fugaces, Postume, Postume, labuntur anni (1-2); 15, iam pauca aratro iugera moles relinquent (1-2); 16, vivitur parvo bene (13); 17, utrumque nostrum incredibili modo consentit astrum (21-22); 18, Quid. . . pueris (32-34); 19, Bacchum. . . docentem (1-2); 20, 21-24.

Book 3

1-6 (see above); 7, 29-32; 8, 27-28; 9, 24; 10, 9; 11, 33-36; 12, Miserarum. . . lavere (1-2); 13, 13; 14, 13-16; 15, 2; 16, 17; 17, 13-16; 18, 1-4; 19, parcentes ego dexteris odi: sparge rosas (21-22); 20, 1-2; 21, 5-8; 22, 1; 23, 17-20; 24, quid leges sine moribus vanae proficiunt (35-36); 25, 17-18; 26, 9-12; 27, 25-28; 28, 5-8; 29, 41-45; 30, 1.

Book 4

1, Non sum qualis eram bonae sub regno Cinarum (1-2); 2, 49-52; 3, 21-24; 4, 29; 5, Quaerit patria Caesarem (16); 6, 29-30; 7, Immortalia. . . diem (7-8); 8, gaudes. . . donare (11-12); 9, paullum. . . virtus (29-30); 10, 7; 11, 17-20; 12, 28; 13, 17-20; 14, 37-40; 15, Tua, Caesar, aetas (4).

Carmen Saeculare, 1-4.

COLORADO COLLEGE,
COLORADO SPRINGS

CHARLES C. MIEROW

REVIEWS

The Traditions of European Literature from Homer to Dante. By Barrett Wendell. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons (1920). Pp. x + 669. \$6.00.

This is a fascinating and inspiring book which will do much to make the cultured layman and even the scholar read with a livelier interest the best classical authors. Its enthusiasm is contagious and it will make ancient literature popular. Professor Wendell was one of the first in America to introduce the popularization of literature, a phenomenon seen now in nearly every College in the courses on Greek and Latin Literature in English (compare THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 8.115-117, 153-156); but his volume, though written in a very readable and interesting style, is quite different from the recent popularization of history seen in Wells's interesting but somewhat inaccurate book, The Outline of History. Professor Wendell was no theorist or propagandist or pseudoscientist. Scholars who are prejudiced against such books may well learn a lesson from this work, which is full of the soundest generalizations, that hit the nail on the head almost every time. It is truly remarkable that one who was not a specialist in the Classics could have such a fine and accurate appreciation of the Greek and Latin literatures, such a proper perspective. It shows the influence of correct environment and good associations and of good taste in books and literature.

Professor Wendell catalogues the items of our heritage from ancient Europe and gives the story of the development of literature in Greece, Rome, and the Middle Ages with especial reference to those writers who have influenced our civilization and our literature. His work is divided into five books, of several chapters each, as follows:

Book I, The Traditions of Greece (1-158): Chapter I, To 500 before Christ—Historical Traditions, Homer, The Iliad and Hesiod, Lyric Poetry—Alcaeus, Sappho, Anacreon, Pindar (9-44); Chapter II, The Fifth Century before Christ—Historical Traditions, Aeschylus, Sophocles, Herodotus, Thucydides, Euripides, Aristophanes (45-103); Chapter III, The Fourth Century before Christ—Historical Traditions, Xenophon, Plato, Demosthenes, Aristotle, Theophrastus, Menander (104-139); Chapter IV, From 300 B. C. to the Roman Conquest of Greece (146 B. C.)—Historical Traditions, Theocritus (140-152); Chapter V, The Greek Tradition (152-158).

Book II, The Traditions of Rome (161-347): Chapter I, To 100 before Christ—Historical Traditions, Literary Traditions, Plautus, Terence (161-178); Chapter II, The First Century before Christ—Historical Traditions, Cicero, Caesar, Lucretius, Catullus, Sallust, Virgil, Horace, Elegiac Poetry (Tibullus, Propertius), Ovid, Livy (179-277); Chapter III, The First Century of the Christian Era—Historical Traditions, Literature under Tiberius (Velleius Paterculus, Valerius Maximus, Phaedrus), Literature under Nero (Seneca, Lucan, Petronius, Persius), Literature under the Flavian Emperors (Pliny the Elder, Quintilian, Silius Italicus, Valerius Flaccus, Statius), Martial, The Younger Pliny, Tacitus, Juvenal (278-329); Chapter IV, The Second Century of the Christian Era—Historical Traditions, Literary Traditions: Suetonius, Apuleius, Pervigilium Veneris, Lucian, Galen (330-341); Chapter V, The Roman Tradition (342-347).

Book III, The Traditions of Christianity (357-387): Chapter I, Religion and Empire (351-361); Chapter II, The Old Testament (362-371); Chapter III, The New Testament (372-379); Chapter IV, The Church (379-387).

Book IV, The Traditions of Christendom (391-463): Chapter I, The Third Century—Historical Traditions, Literary Traditions (391-396); Chapter II, The Fourth Century—Historical Traditions, Ausonius, The Fathers of the Church (397-418); Chapter III, The Fifth Century—Historical Traditions, Literary Traditions (419-424); Chapter IV, The Sixth Century—Historical Traditions, Boethius (425-435); Chapter V, The Seventh Century—Historical Traditions, Literary Traditions (436-441); Chapter VI, The Eighth Century—Historical Traditions, Literary Traditions (442-451); Chapter VII, The Ninth Century—Historical Traditions, Literary Traditions (452-456); Chapter VIII, The Tenth Century—Historical Traditions, Literary Traditions (457-459); Chapter IX, The Tradition of the Dark Ages (460-463).

Book V, The Traditions of the Middle Ages (467-616): Chapter I, The Eleventh Century—Historical Traditions, The Song of Roland (467-485); Chapter II, The Twelfth Century—Historical Traditions, Literary Traditions, Romantic Epics ("Chansons de Geste" and "Romans"), Minor Forms of Poetry, Latin Lyrics, French Lyrics, The Troubadours (486-539); Chapter III, The Thirteenth Century—Historical Traditions, The Romance of the Rose, Reynard the Fox, The Golden Legend, The Saints (Dominic, Francis of Assisi, Louis, Thomas Aquinas), Lyrics (Latin, French, and Provençal), Italian Lyrics, Dante (540-612); Chapter IV, The Tradition of the Middle Ages (613-616).

Professor Wendell meant to take up only those authors who "so lingered in literature as to become part of the habitual thought of Europe", but sometimes there are serious omissions. Little attention is paid to the Pre-Socratics and to Heraclitus, though the latter has had an intense influence on recent literature. Simonides, who was so admired by Matthew Arnold, is ignored. The Greek Anthology is neglected entirely. Demosthenes's influence on Cicero and so on Edmund Burke, Daniel Webster, and many another is well brought out, but not a word is said of Isocrates, whose influence was so great on the Renaissance, not a word of Aristotle's Poetics, not a word of the Treatise on the Sublime. No account is given of Sappho's tremendous influence on later literature, and Professor Wendell is ignorant of the new editions of Wharton and of all the new fragments of Sappho (38). No account of the influence of Pindar (who is more than a tradition) on Ronsard, Gray, Shelley, and many another writer is given. He does not mention Thomas Moore's translations of Anacreon and the Anacreontics. But in general Professor Wendell, even if he is not acquainted with the many recent learned dissertations on the influence of classical authors on later literature, and even if some important titles are missing in the good and full Bibliographical Suggestions (617-630), gives the essential facts of development and influence, as in his most excellent pages on Theophrastus (135-137), Menander (137-139), Theocritus (148-152), Cicero (190-199), Caesar (200-205), and Petronius (298-299). Many of his sentences and many of his

portraits of the authors and his comparisons of the remote past with the near past are extremely apt.

... The forms of Grecian temples and of Roman arches or amphitheatres still affect our architecture; we still make statues after the manner which was first clearly defined in Periclean Athens; we think in terms like those idiomatic in Rome and in Greece, as distinguished from those in which Egyptians thought or the diverse peoples of Asia. . . <9-10>.

... The course of time, however, has proved the originally peculiar civilisation of Greece and the traditions which it came to cherish historically ancestral, like nothing else, to every phase of the development of Europe. Thither, most of all, we must look to see whence, in almost everything but the body, we ourselves came <11>.

... The pitiless code of Draco, the shrewd wisdom of Solon, the benevolent tyranny of Pisistratus, weakening into the self-indulgence of Hippias and Hipparchus overthrown by the liberty-loving outbreak of Harmodius and Aristogiton, seem comparatively our own. So does the restlessly intelligent succession of incessant political experiment, tending further and further from the restraints of monarchy and of aristocracy to the untested license of democracy <15>.

... No single passage¹ more wonderfully summarises the freshness of conception which makes one feel these heroes as real to-day as they were when poetry first brought them into being, centuries before Athens was historic <20>.

... Each time you thus recur to them <the Iliad and the Odyssey>, you will find in them a quality which will impress you the more the better you know them. No matter how familiar they may become, it is hardly possible to read them without a sense that they are always as new as if you had never read them before. Age cannot wither nor custom stale them <25>.

... Great though other antique poets be, Homer—swiftly, simply, nobly primal—is greatest <26>.

... For narrative skill and sustained interest Herodotus remains enduringly excellent; for thoughtful and animated statement of contemporary fact, no writer has excelled Thucydides; and together they give us a marvellous impression of how the Fifth Century began and how it ended <70-71>.

... Ancient words were always addressed to the ear; modern words are generally addressed to the eye. . . <72>.

... So long as men like good stories well told, they will not tire of Herodotus <78>.

... <Thucydides> was thus both a full contemporary of the historical period he has recorded, and to some extent a participant in its action; while Herodotus was neither. . . <79>.

... Herodotus writes its magnificent prologue², Thucydides its fatal epilogue; neither tells its story. . . <80>.

... <Thucydides> writes more like a judge, summing up evidence, than like an advocate emphasising facts to support his side of the case; so his prose, as he tells what men were, and what they did and what happened to them, has a literary quality almost Shakspearean. He often seems an almost final model for those who would provide others with a firm and solid basis for historical generalisation <81>.

... Thucydides developed the already conventional use of speeches in what he meant to be authentic

¹Professor Wendell is writing of Iliad 3.121-244.

²Professor Wendell was writing of the Age of Pericles.

history; the method is something like that of Shakspeare, when with frankly dramatic purpose he wrote the funeral speeches of Brutus and of Antony over the body of Julius Caesar. The passage describing the plague at Athens reveals at least two phases of Thucydidean mastery: coming directly after the funeral oration of Pericles, it so contrasts with this as both ironically and dramatically to emphasise how slightly idealism can foresee the chances of reality, and how relentless these chances must be; taken by itself it is one of the three tremendous accounts of pestilence in European literature—the other two are Boccaccio's introduction to the *Decameron* and Defoe's description of the Plague at London. Finally, if you will take the time to read the Sixth and Seventh Books, which deal with the fatal expedition to Sicily, you will not waste a moment; should this task prove, as it probably may, too arduous, you will find the grim end of the story incomparable for precision, clearness, and sheer narrative power. It has often been held the greatest masterpiece of military history ever achieved <83-84>.

...<Demosthenes> stands to all Europe, Butcher clearly points out, in some such relation as that of Edmund Burke to the parliamentary eloquence of England. Both were consummate masters of language; both counted with human nature; both were faithful students of history; both sincerely believed in the constitutional traditions of their national inheritance; both raised occasional eloquence to the height of enduring political thought excellently expressed; both have thus won secure place not only in history but in literature. Yet each, to do his work, was perforce a man of his own time; and the time even of Burke is dead and gone. How much of either must be counted as humanly temporal, how much may be accepted as humanly eternal, nobody can quite tell. The one sure thing is that the methods of Burke long survived the parliamentary conditions where they originated, and that the methods of Demosthenes, originating in the democratic conditions of Fourth Century Athens, have more or less directly affected European oratory ever since. To go no further, Cicero was aware of them, and Burke was aware of them and of Cicero as well, and Daniel Webster, aware of both Cicero and Demosthenes, was aware of Burke into the bargain. Orators do things still—assert principle, for example, appeal to prejudice, denounce opponents—not only because these things must be done anyhow but also, and perhaps considerably, because these were the methods fixed in tradition by the master who finally brought oratory into literature, while Philip and Alexander were conquering the liberties of Greece <127-128>.

...Taken by themselves, the Characters of Theophrastus would hardly deserve attention in a consideration so cursory as ours. They chanced, however, in far later times, to stimulate imitations among the English and the French. Without them, to go no further, we should hardly have had the *Caractères* of La Bruyère or the numerous "Character-Writings" of Seventeenth Century England. Without these we should hardly have had, in their present form, the sketches of character in the essays of Addison and of Steele. Without these sketches—Sir Roger de Coverley, for example—we should hardly have had the novels of Richardson and of Fielding; and without them the whole popular literature of the Nineteenth Century might have taken another turn. So Theophrastus has his place in the ancestry of prose fiction <136-137>.

...Somehow, his <Theocritus's> appeal has never quite died. The names of his idyllic personages linger always familiar—Daphnis, for example, Thyrsis, Tityrus, Amaryllis, Corydon, and Lycidas. Virgil,

as we have already observed, acceptably imitated him for the revived fashion of Augustan Rome; and Virgil was imitated far and wide twelve or fifteen centuries later. And Spenser's first work was the *Shepherd's Calendar*, which tried to bring pastoral conventions a little nearer the nature from which they had been wandering ever since Theocritus first led them astray. When we remember, though, that Spenser's own lament for the death of Sir Philip Sidney disguises Sir Philip as a shepherd called *Astrophel*, we shall remind ourselves at once how deep and how vagrant the influence of the pastoral has proved. It has given English literature our two noblest mortuary poems, the *Lycidas* of Milton and the *Adonais* of Shelley. It has shown itself, on the other hand, in such graceful trifles as the *Pastor Fido* of Guarini, the *Aminta* of Tasso, and the *Sad Shepherd* of Ben Jonson. Without it, we might hardly have had in their actual form the ballets of Italian opera, nor the Dresden china figures which made gay with flowery colour the light boudoir of the Eighteenth Century. Without it, Marie Antoinette might hardly have played the milkmaid in her toy village at Trianon, nor English-speaking children have told you all about Little Bo-Peep.

And this recurrently fascinating prettiness was the last thing established among the literary traditions of Europe by the antique, unique originality of primal Greece <151-152>.

...His <Cicero's> letters are those of an accomplished gentleman, in the finer sense of the word; they show his complete urbanity of social habit—among other things he was reported the best diner-out of his times, and his witticisms, were repeated far and wide; they also show his politely alert familiarity with intelligent thought, with fine art and with literature, Greek and Latin; they could have proceeded only from a man who knew how to enjoy the cream of life. Here if ever in the whole course of literature you find yourself in thoroughly good company; and thoroughly good company implies highly trained minds and manners. His orations, whether legal or political, could have been produced by nothing less than assiduous and life-long study, under the most skilful teachers, of an extraordinarily adroit and subtle art. Whether, under any circumstances, oratory has quite so much practical value as we are apt to assume is beside the point; Cicero could do at will whatever can be done with it. ...<195-196>.

...From beginning to end, though, he <Caesar> impresses you as a writer who knows exactly what he means to say about a commander who always knew exactly what he meant to do. To this extent, the whole range of literature contains nothing more saturated with the temper of mastery than the *Commentaries* of Caesar <203>.

Of course it is impossible not to find a few errors in detail in a book which covers such an enormous field, but, as I have said, the generalizations are almost always correct. For this very reason we hate to see certain slovenly statements. Why say "I have mislaid my reference for this" (385, note 1)? Why not look up Tertullian, *Apologeticus* 50, for *Semen est sanguis Christianorum*, which is generally quoted as *Sanguis martyrum semen Christianorum* (Beyerslinck, *Magnum Theatrum Vitae Humanorum*, 1665)? Why not look up in a dictionary of quotations, such as *Fumagalli*, *Chi l'ha detto*, the original authority for *Censeo Carthaginem esse delendam*, instead of saying (169, note 1) "Provokingly enough, I have not lighted on the original authority. . ." There one

would find references to Plutarch, Cato 27; Servius on Vergil, Aeneid 4.683; Livy, Epitome 49; Valerius Maximus, De Dictis Memorabilibus 8.15.2. On page 93, note 1, it is stated that the term *Deus ex machina*, "usually supposed to be originally Latin, is said first to occur, and only allusively, in the *Hermotimus* of Lucian (86), a Greek dialogue of the Second Century A.D." The Latin term is, however, a translation of the Greek *θεὸς ἐκ μηχανῆς* (or *ἐκ μηχανῆς*), which actually occurs in Lucian, *Philopseudes* (29), as well as in *Hermotimus* (86). The *μηχανή* was used as early as 430 B.C.; and the idea is already expressed in Plato, *Cratylus* 425 D, and Pseudo-Plato, *Cleitophon* 407 A; Scholia on Plato 394; and Aristotle, *Poetics* 15.7. Menander (*Frag.* 227, Kock) actually has the words *ἐκ μηχανῆς θεός*. Horace, *Ars Poetica* 191, using *deus* alone, refers to the same device; so also Cicero, *De Natura Deorum* 1.53. On page 138 we read that somewhere in Egypt fragments of Menander have been found. This is too vague, especially since we read on page 98 that of Greek comedies only some plays of Aristophanes survive. It is strange to hear (43) that rhyme was never used by the ancients, when we know that the Lydians had it and that the Greeks frequently used it or employed assonance, but perhaps we owe rhyme as much to the Arabians as to the Lydians. Athens was not fortified as never before under Pericles (48), nor does Thespis belong to the fifth century (52), since his first official victory was in 534. It is very doubtful whether in the fifth century the Greek actors wore megaphonic masks and high-soled buskins, and facial expression was certainly not out of the question (53). Since the discovery of Sophocles's *Trackers* (59), the *Cyclops* of Euripides is no longer the only extant satyr-drama. Jebb's translation of Sophocles is fairly literary (63); and, since Sophocles (born 497) wrote most of his plays after he was fifty, it can hardly be said that his quality as a tragic poet was fully developed by 450 (69).

Especially praiseworthy is the detailed index of more than twenty-five pages (643-669), where the dates of the different authors are also given. Praxiteles, however, belongs to the early fourth century B. C., not to the fifth (662).

The scholarly world mourns the loss of such a great literary character as Professor Wendell, whose recent death has prevented the completion of the second volume, which was to continue the subject from Dante to modern times, a field with which Professor Wendell was even more familiar.

THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY DAVID M. ROBINSON

Selected Articles on the Study of Latin and Greek. By Lamar T. Beman. New York: H. W. Wilson Co. (1921). Pp. li + 237.

Mr. Lamar's book is meant to be a manual for debaters, and also a guide for children and parents who wish help in the choice of subjects to be studied. In this aspect, it appears to be an answer to the pamphlet called *The Practical Value of Latin*, published by The Classical Association of the Atlantic States. This pamphlet is described as propaganda material, containing *ex parte* statements of interested persons.

Mr. Lamar endeavors to bring together the best that has been said on both sides of the controversy, to give complete bibliographical references, and to present the whole argument in debaters' briefs. The author, a Cleveland attorney, has succeeded reasonably well in maintaining a nonpartisan attitude, and very well in making his bibliography complete. His affirmative bibliography, however, is not so good as that published by The Philadelphia Society for the Promotion of Liberal Studies (*THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* 15.24). Thus, there is no reference to Adams, *Some Present Collegiate Tendencies*, in which Mr. Adams retracted the views expressed in *A College Fetish*. The admission of error by Mr. Flexner, in the Introduction to the new edition of *A Modern School*, came too late for inclusion (August, 1921). There is no allusion to the statistical refutation of Mr. Flexner's arguments. Mr. Brown's *Study of Ability in Latin in Secondary Schools* (1919; see *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* 15.153-160, 162-164) has been strangely omitted, but Starch, *Experimental Data on the Value of Studying Foreign Languages* (*The School Review* 23.697 ff.) is quoted in full, though it was published in 1915 and is therefore now out of date. There is no mention of the fact that the arguments for Latin are cumulative, though this is possibly the strongest point in their favor (Shorey, *The Case for the Classics*, quoted by Mr. Beman, 30; Nutting, *The Cumulative Argument for the Study of Latin, School and Society* 4.858 f., and elsewhere; Sage, *The Classics for Engineers*, *Bulletin of the Society for the Promotion of Engineering Education* 10.369). Professor Fairclough's paper, *The Practical Bearing of High School Latin*, *The Classical Journal* 10.126 ff., thought by many educators to be the best statement of the case, is not mentioned. These articles are, indeed mentioned in the bibliography, but attention is not directed to them, and the cumulative argument is not included in the affirmative brief. The constant use of the phrase "dull and dismal grind" in the negative brief is an unworthy appeal to prejudice, while the debater's characteristic positiveness on controversial questions mars the book for the parent. Thus, the affirmative claims that classical study is "universally recognized" as the foundation of all true culture, while the negative asserts that the study of ancient languages is "very harmful" as a means of mental training. Snedden's recent book, *Sociological Determination of Objectives in Education*, might have helped the negative cause.

Despite these imperfections, the book gives a very valuable collection of materials, and every teacher of Latin can help himself greatly by making his own refutation of the negative argument.

UNIVERSITY OF PITTSBURGH

EVAN T. SAGE